25X1[°]

NEP SINECTIVE NO. BLB - NATIONAL RECORNALISANCE OFFICE Washington

Engeort Activities Management NRP FINANCIAL MAMAGEMENT PROCEDURES

SUBMINE: This document outlines the financial management procedures for the National Recommissance Program; describes an annual financial cycle; amplifies on the roles and responsibilities of the DERO, the ERO Comptroller and the Program placetors in financial management; and describes the relationships of personnel outside the National Recommissance Office in the financial processes.

1. ENTENNITIONS:

In the context of this document, the following definitions apply:

Came 20th. The "current" fiscal year applies to actions during this time period. The term "operating" fiscal year is used to distinguish preparatory efforts before July 1st which will lead to actions during the next current fiscal year. The "Dudget" fiscal year is that immediately following the operating or current fiscal year. For example, during essentially the first half of current fiscal year 1966, NRO development and

continuous will occur. During essentially the second half of the current fiscal year 1935, proparatory actions for operating year 1967 and budget year 1963 will occur.

- b. The "Sec Def program procedures" i clude in the case of the MRP the annual submission of official Program Change Proposal (PCP) documents by the Secretary of the Air Force to the Secretary of Defense: Format A's, which are prepared by the OSD analysts, and summarize the submitted PCP, with the analysts' recommendations for approval or change; Format B's, which announce the Secretary of Defense's decision to the Sec AF; Format B Acknowledgements, which meanely record official receipt of the Format B; and Format B reclams, which are the official means for requesting reconsideration of certain Sec Def decisions. These are all based on designated "program elements," which include all appropriation costs involved. Inherently, the procedure also includes special studies, cost-effectiveness analyses, and detailed program and cost reviews by OSD personnel.
- c. In addition to the preceding program formats, there are a number of other pertinent official or unofficial OSD forms related to MRP financial activities; (1) The apportionment requests, submitted by fiscal appropriation to OSD, ask for official release of funds by OSD against Congressional appropriations or interim authority, and are

ordinarily submitted by the Air Force in early-June.

The MRP accounts are included under innocuous entries, such as Classified Projects, Other Charges and Special Support Activities.

- (2) Reprogramming Actions, submitted by fiscal appropriation to OED, request official transfer of funds during the current year from one program to another within the appropriation. These ultimately are furnished to Congress for review.
- (3) The Air Force Budget Estimate, submitted by fiscal appropriation to OSD, requests official approval of the submitted programs and costs for inclusion in the President's Budget. The MRP accounts again use the innocuous entries.
- ontire amount in the appropriation request for a line entry at the beginning of a fiscal year, the unreleased amount is placed on an "OSD deferred list," and a memorandum from the Air Force to OSD must be submitted requesting release, a responding "program approval" memorandum must be issued by OSD, then followed by a financial approval memo from OSD Comptroller. Invariably, sizeable NRP amounts are placed on the OSD deferred list at the beginning of a fiscal year. This does not necessarily inhibit program approvals to the directors under NRO procedures, but does preclude full realese of funds.

3	SEET	25X2

- (5) Pariodic obligation and expenditure forecasts and extatus reports by fiscal appropriation are furnished to OMD. Again, to immeduous entries are used for the IMP accounts.
- (6) Special formats are developed for presentation of budget estimates to CSD and EOB reviewers, and others for presentation to Congress. These are usually non-standard, and adapted to the situation or changing requests.

2. GIIIRAL CONCEPT:

The NRP financial management procedures are "streamlined" in mature, in that programs and costs are not subjected to extensive reviews by a number of echolons within the Air Force and OCD; valvers have been granted on compliance with certain regulations, data submissions, and control precedures; a major portion of the funds available are issued directly to the program directors; costing studies and exercises are minimized; and more fund flexibility within the IMP is allowable than under regular Air Force accounts. However, this places an added burden on the entire MAP to follow good management practices, and demonstrate offective utilization of funds available, in order to continue on the "streamlined" basis. The IMP financial management procedures generally follow or parallel prescribed or standard techniques in many instances - the DCD programming system is followed; there are official budget "calls," program approvals, and fund controls; contracting is in accordance with specified regulations, and

TOP STORT

all contracts are independently audited; cost-effectiveness studies are made; menthly financial status reports are required, as well as quarterly program status reports; appropriation and accounting laws and regulations must be observed; and cost estimates and fund utilization are subjected to OCD, Dureau of Eudget and Congressional reviews.

2. YERN FIRMMODAL CYCLE:

- 2. A new financial cycle is initiated annually when the INO ComputeDer (with the assistance of SAFES) develops epocific requests to all program directors for cost estimate authoriseians for the ensuing "operating" fiscal year, the budget year, and four succeeding years. This coverage is required under the fac Def program procedures, and the timing of the request and submission due dates relate directly to fac Def prescribed dates for departmental apportionment requests, Program Change Proposal submissions, and budget estimate submissions. The requests are reviewed by the DURO, and are issued to the program directors over DURO signature. These requests are ordinarily issued about mid-librah, and call for Director's submissions in the May 1-15 timesperiod.
- b. Indemuch as the cost estimate requests are annual, and a number of projects are continuing in nature, the program directors can take anticipatory actions before those

5

requests are received. For example, assessment can be made of the status of past and current year funding programs; exploration and establishment of at least tentative program goals (flying hows) test programs, launch programs, etc.); analysis of contract status in relation to future funding requirements; identification of unit costs for project components; exploratory discussions with contractors; identification of desirable new projects or tasks; etc.

- c. The cost estimates, and the program considerations which form the basis for the estimates, are required to be submitted in significant detail for the ensuing operating fiscal year and the budget year. Estimates for the then succeeding four fiscal years may be in less detail, as specified in the DNRO cost estimate request (inasmuch as these are "planning" estimates, subject to reconcideration with the next fiscal year's submissions). Complete cost estimates are required from each program director, covering all projects or tasks under his assigned jurisdiction.
- d. When the cost estimates are submitted by the program directors, the NRO Comptroller (with the assistance of SAFSS) immediately begins a detailed analysis of the ensuing "operating" fiscal year requirements. This analysis involves not only the operating year, but prior and future year costs as well, to identify past experience and trends, as well as future impacts. Discussions are hold with the

program director and project personnel, and correspondence is exchanged as required on any questionable areas.

- e. After completion of an intensive review, the MRO Comptroller discusses his recommendations for initial program approvals for the ensuing operating year, with full recognition of program director submissions, with the DUNO. After DUNO review and reaction, a specific initial program approval memorandum to each program director is developed by the NRO Comptroller for DUNO sig ature. These initial program approval memos are ordinarily issued before July 1, in order that the program directors may initiate their programs at the beginning of the fiscal year under DUNO guidence. The program directors may recommend changes to these initial program approvals at any time thruout the fiscal year.
- operating year, the NRO Comptroller issues instructions to

 25X1 on the amounts by fiscal appropriation to

 be included in apportionment requests to CSD (these can not

 exceed amounts included in the President's Budget), and

 justifies apportionment request details to appropriate OSD

 personnel. When the OSD apportionment release amounts are

 established, the NRO Comptroller instructs

25X1 NRO 25X1

25X1 25X1 **25**X1 25X1 Fund releases to the program directors are generally on a fiscal quarter basis; however, the program directors have full authority to proceed contractually against the DNRO initial program approvals for the entire fiscal year, and as revised program approvals are issued. The fund release process continues thruout the fiscal 25X1 year, based on NRO Comptroller specific instructions NRO 25X1 NRO After the initial program approvals and funds are issued against the operating year, the NRO Comptroller (with the assistance of SAFSS) concentrates on the budget year estimates, and then the four succeeding year estimates, preparatory to the development of Program Change Proposals and budget estimate submissions. Technically, the Program

٤

Change Proposal (PCP) is due to GSD by June 1st; however, arrangements with OSD have enabled delays in the past up until mid-September (there is no quarantee in any year that submission extensions will be granted). One of the specified criteria for the departmental budget estimate submissions (invariably due October 1st) is that cost estimated must be supported by approved or submitted PCP's.

- h. In analyzing the budget and future year cost ostimates, discussions and correspondence exchanges with the program directors apply, to clarify any questionable area or develop cost revisions based on project or task changed approaches. Periodic discussions are held with the DMRO as the analysis of portions of estimates are completed, then final over-all sessions for the total NRP are hold to establish the DAMO-recommended PCP and budget submissions. The program directors will have access to the DNRO budget recommendations for their accounts at any time after DNRO initial determinations are made, and may reclama any portions thereof, with written substantiation for the roclama. Under the new MRP agreement, a budget review by the NRP Executive Committee may be held either before or after official submission of PCP's and budgets to CSD, as technically the President's Rudget is open for decision until early December.
 - i. In developing the PCP's and budget and supporting

data, the MMO Comptroller must rearrange the estimates into groupings specified by OSD, determine proper appropriation chargeability, reflect costs against OSD standard development-investment-operating categories, portray obligations against prior year funds in detail, reflect line-item supporting data for all projects or tasks,

25X1

25X1 NRO

on the amounts to be included in the

al NRO

budget estimates, prepare the PCP's, and insure that PCP's and budget estimates for projects related to the MRP, but not directly chargeable to the MRP are related and consistent.

j. Electly after submission of the PCP, thorough reviews with OSD and BOB personnel are hold by the NRO Comptroller, with assistance of the program directors as any be required. As the OSD/BOB detailed examinations continue, they ordinarily contact SAYSS, the program directors, other personnel in their own organizations, etc., to discuss technical aspects, capabilities, relationships to other efforts, etc. From these reviews, program and funding issues may develop, which are subject to resolution with the IRO Comptroller, the DIRO, OSD EBRASE and Comptroller on the relatively minor issues, and with the Boputy Sec Bef or Esc Bef and the Directors of Central Intelligence and the Eureau of Budget if a major issue develops.

k. When the issues are settled, OID ordinarily prepares

10

	a Format A (analyst's evaluation and recommendation to				
	Coe Dof, and a Format B (See Dof Decision) reflecting				
	the approved program, which is cent to the				
25X1 NRO	and must be officially acknowledged even NRC				
	if a reclama is intended. In some instances, timing or				
	other circumstances may preclude a Format B issuance, in				
	which case a Sec Def Subject/Issue budget decision would be				
25X1 NRO	issued to In either event, they set the				
·	President's Budget figures. The program directors are then				
	officially notified of the amounts included in the President's				
	Endgot for their accounts, for forward planning purposes				
	(Lowever, no contractual actions can be taken against these				
	amounts).				

1. Preparatory to testifying before Congress on the MRP Dudget, the OSD Comptroller and DDRRE are briefed by the NRO Comptroller on program and cost highlights, and special formats are prepared for their assistance. Generally, a one-time session is held with the Congressional chairmen on the NRP budget, with participation also by the ECI and DNRO. Subsequently, the cleared Committee clerks will have separate detailed sessions with the NRO Comptroller periodically.

m. While these PCP and budget actions are proceeding, current fiscal year financial management actions are continuing, and apply thruout the fiscal year. New or changed proposals from the program directors are considered and given official reactions by the DNRO, funds are issued, program

10	1 1	

analyses are made, and additional or changed program direction may be issued by the DNNO. There is a system of menthly financial status reports from each of the program directors, generally adapted to tie in with their individual financial information needs. Also, quarterly reports are required from each program director, which summarize program highlights, accomplishments against objectives, problems, solutions, contract status, etc. Both the menthly and quarterly reports are very important to program and financial management.

n. Invariably, OSD withholds a significant portion of MMO funds from apportionment release at the beginning of a fiscal year. This necessitates that the MMO Comptroller initiate action to obtain release of the "deferred" funds thru additional discussions and reviews with OSD, proparation of official requests for DNMO signature, and further instructions to when program approvals and funds are released by OSD

25X1 NRO

o. Presently, all MRP funds are included in "no year" appropriations (available for obligation until expended). Accordingly, a particular financial cycle may involve obligations and will involve expenditures in later fiscal years. Accordingly, the financial cycle is not complete until a particular fiscal years funds are completely expended. Thruout the entire process, the program directors are expected to maintain good

12

paragement practices with respect to application of funds, obligations and expenditures.

4. OWNER PERTINENT CONSIDERATIONS:

25X1 NR 0 that available funds are effectively 25X1

and properly utilized, and that continuing efforts be made

13

 	2.1	

to reduce supporting costs, consistent with the high priority efforded the program.

5. DEFECTIVE DATE:

Incomech as this is primarily a summation of ordisting financial management procedures, and any refinements or changes reflected herein will be addressed in more detail in future financial actions, it should be considered informative rather than directive in nature. Accordingly, no preceding financial management directives, instructions or practices are changed hereby.

